UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,295	10/26/2006	Himke Van Der Velde	P18216-US1	2060

27045   7590   08/27/2009

ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVR 1-C-11
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER
SCHWARTZ, JOSHUA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 May 2009_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _5,8-16,31-35 and 39-51_ is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _5,8-16,31-35 and 39-51_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application

1.   This is a Final Office Action on the Merits. **Claims 8-16, 31-35, & 39-51** are present for examination at this time. Claim 48 stands amended to correct a clerical error from the previous version of the claim. Previously Claim 48 recited "the user equipment of Claim 48" which made it self referential. Now it recites "the user equipment of Claim 47". In the previous rejection, Claim 48 was rejected as indefinite. However, for purposes of the 102(b) rejection in the previous application, it was interpreted to recite "the user equipment of Claim 47. Therefore the previous prior art rejection of this claim is still valid, and is maintained herein.

2.   Claims 8-16, 31-35, & 39-51 are rejected.

3.   Please note that Examiner's art unit has changed to 2617.

Response to Arguments

With regard to applicant's arguments on page 12 that Wiberg fails to teach "SIB 'type extension indicator' " or "SIB 'type extension field' ", Examiner directs Applicant to page 3 of the previous action. In that action Examiner noted that the disclosure of system information "tags" in Wiberg were equivalent, i.e. another name for, "system information block type extension field", and provided reasoning as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would consider this so. Examiner, in that action, acknowledged that Wiberg did not use the exact same terminology as Applicant, but that it did not matter as the elements were the same. Applicant's response, does not address this fact. Furthermore, Applicant did not provide any reasoning as to why these elements are not equivalent. Therefore in the absence of any such reasoning, Examiner maintains the rejection for Claim 8 for the same reasons as the previous action. Wiberg still anticipates claims 8, 15, and 47. Wiberg therefore still combines with Numminen and still combines with TS.25.331 to cover all the dependent claims listed in the previous rejection. Those grounds of rejection are maintained herein.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8-10, 15-16, 47, 48, and 51 are rejected as being anticipated by "Method and Apparatus for Broadcasting System Information in a Cellular Communications Network" by Wiberg et al., US6628946B1 ("Wiberg").

Claim 8 is disclosed by "Method and Apparatus for Broadcasting System Information in a Cellular Communications Network" by Wiberg et al., US6628946B1 ("Wiberg")

Wiberg discloses a method of operating a node a of a telecommunications network which prepares network system information for transmission across an air interface to a user equipment unit (Wiberg teaches using the SIB type values in a telecommunications network., Col. 3 ll. 5-7 and 11-15, including a base station which is a node ,Col 1. line 20) comprising the steps of: including a first system information block type extension indicator in the system information block type field of the referencing block (Wiberg teaches that the SIB type values are included in master information blocks which contain the system information blocks Col 3. ll. 11-12, aka 'SIB's' and other referencing information blocks to which the SIB's refer, these SIB's contain system information parameters, Col 3, ll. 20-23); when the system information block type for a system information block referenced by the referencing block does not have a system information block type value in a nominal range of system information block type values, (Wiberg also teaches that if the SIB value received by a mobile station is unknown, then the mobile station will retrieve system information, Col. 15 ll. 49-52 "If the[system information] tag is not found, the MS locates and reads the system information block from the appropriate broadcast slave channel indicated in the master block."); including a first system information block type extension field in the referencing block (Col 16. ll. 27-31storing new system information blocks, and Col 3 ll. 20-26, where the System Information type extension fields are the same as the system information "tags" in Wiberg).; including in the first system information block type extension field a system information block type extension value which indicates a

system information block type for the system information block referenced by the referencing block (Col 3 ll. 40-43, where when the mobile station does not receive a system information block with known values, i.e. in a nominal range it will acquire and store as a parameter in the appropriate field, the system information for the appropriate equipment, and associate it with the appropriate referencing data structures); and including a second system information block type extension indicator in the system information block type field of a segment of the system information block referenced by the referencing block (Id.) .

Claim 15 tracks the claim language of Claim 8 and its meaning. Claim 15 also essentially states that if the received SIB type value does not correspond to a known SIB type value, then a new value will be created for that SIB type and associated with the reference block value that accompanied that SIB type value.

Claim 15 is also rejected for the same reasons as Claim 8. Claim 15's distinction from Claim 8, is that instead of being directed to a method of operating a node, it is directed to a method of receiving network system information. This limitation is also found in Wiberg (Col 3. ll. 12-13)

Wiberg teaches using the SIB type values in a telecommunications network. (Col. 3 ll. 5-7 and 11-15). It teaches that the SIB type values are included in master information blocks which contain the system information blocks 'SIB's' and other referencing information blocks to which the SIB's refer (Col 3. ll. 21-22). Wiberg also teaches that if the SIB value received by a mobile station is unknown, then the mobile station will retrieve system information (Col. 15 ll. 49-51) and storing new system information blocks (Col 16. ll. 27-31).

With regard to Claim 47 (Independent), this claim, like Claim 15, also tracks the claim language of Claim 8 and its meaning. Claim 47 also essentially states that if the received SIB type value does not correspond to a known SIB type value, then a new value will be created for that SIB type and associated with the reference block value that accompanied that SIB type value.

Claim 47 is also rejected for the same reasons as Claim 8. Claim 47's distinction from Claim 8, is that instead of being directed to a method of operating a node, it is directed to a user equipment unit which receives network system information. This limitation is also found in

Wiberg (Col 3. ll. 12-13, where it states that the mobile station, i.e. user equipment unit, received network system information in the form of system information blocks).

Like Claims 8 and 15 Claim 47, in essence states that if the received SIB type value does not correspond to a known SIB type value, then a new value will be created for that SIB type and associated with the reference block value that accompanied that SIB type value.

Wiberg teaches using the SIB type values in a telecommunications network. (Col. 3 ll. 5-7 and 11-15). It teaches that the SIB type values are included in master information blocks which contain the system information blocks 'SIB's' and other referencing information blocks to which the SIB's refer (Col 3. ll. 21-22). Wiberg also teaches that if the SIB value received by a mobile station is unknown, then the mobile station will retrieve system information (Col. 15 ll. 49-51) and storing new system information blocks (Col 16. ll. 27-31).

With regard to Claim 51 (Independent), this claim like Claim 15, also tracks the claim language of Claim 8 and its meaning. Claim 51 also essentially states that if the received SIB type value does not correspond to a known SIB type value, then a new value will be created for that SIB type and associated with the reference block value that accompanied that SIB type value.

Claim 51 is also rejected for the same reasons as Claim 8. Claim 51's distinction from Claim 8, is that instead of being directed to a method of operating a node, it is directed a method for communicating network system information across and air interface between a network node and a user equipment. This limitation is also found in Wiberg which teaches using the SIB type values in a telecommunications network. (Col. 3 ll. 5-7 and 11-15), including a base station which is a node (Col 1. line 20) and (Col 3. ll. 12-13), where it states that the mobile station, i.e. user equipment unit, received network system information in the form of system information blocks.

Like Claims 8 and 15 Claim 51, in essence states that if the received SIB type value does not correspond to a known SIB type value, then a new value will be created for that SIB type and associated with the reference block value that accompanied that SIB type value.

Wiberg teaches using the SIB type values in a telecommunications network. (Col. 3 ll. 5-7 and 11-15). It teaches that the SIB type values are included in master information blocks which contain the system information blocks 'SIB's' and other referencing information blocks to

which the SIB's refer (Col 3. ll. 21-22). Wiberg also teaches that if the SIB value received by a mobile station is unknown, then the mobile station will retrieve system information (Col. 15 ll. 49-51) and storing new system information blocks (Col 16. ll. 27-31).

With regard to Claim 9, Wiberg discloses the method of claim 8 and further discloses comprising the steps of: including a second system information block type extension field in the segment of the system information block referenced by the referencing block; and including in the second system information block type extension field the system information block type extension value which indicates the system information block type for the system information block referenced by the referencing block (Wiberg Figs. 8 and 14 which show SIB type value in the master block associated with a referencing block).

With regard to Claim 16 Wiberg discloses the method of Claim 15 and further discloses comprising the steps of: locating a second system information block type extension field in the segment of the system information block referenced by the referencing block; and obtaining from the second system information block type extension field the system information block type extension value which indicates the system information block type for the system information block referenced by referencing block (Wiberg Figs. 8 and 14 which show SIB type value in the master block associated with a referencing block).

With regard to Claim 48 Wiberg discloses Claim 47 and further discloses further comprising: means for locating a second system information block type extension field in the segment of the system information block referenced by the referencing block; and means for obtaining from the second system information block type extension field the system information block type extension value which indicates the system information block type for the system information block referenced by the referencing block (Wiberg Figs. 8 and 14 which show SIB type values in the master block associated with a referencing block).

With regard to Claim 10, Wiberg discloses the method of Claim 9 and further discloses including the second system information block type extension field in a data field of the segment (Col 3. ll. 11-13 and 21-32, placing SIB information in the master block, within the subcomponent system information block.) It is known that the SIB contains segments. The substructures within the segment can hold values (referred to as "tags" by Wiberg). Deciding where among the substructures to place individual values, is simply a matter of design choice. It

is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art who would want to maximize the efficiency of data

transmitted within a data structure to rearrange where data is stored, and whether or not

redundancy is added to the data structure.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
> subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill
> in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

Claim 11-14 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wiberg in view of "Method for controlling terminal fault corrections in cellular systems", US

2004/0120265A1 by Numminen et al ("Numminen")

With regard to Claim 11, the amount of how many bits to use within the data field is

one of design choice, and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

While Wiberg discloses the method of Claim 10, it does not explicitly teach that the

protocol blocks belong to a Radio Resource Control Protocol. However the preceding limitation

is known in the art of communications. Numminen discloses at ¶ 45 line 36, that the User

Equipment can send protocol blocks via a Radio Resource Channel. Numminen also discloses

that this method is to control device specific behavior due to specific manufacturer data (¶ 5 ll. 5-

6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art who would want use

Applicants' method of accounting for specific manufacturer system information and would want

to reduce errors in that system to use the manufacturer specific techniques of Numminen with

respect to protocol blocks.

With regard to Claim 12, Wiberg discloses the method of claim 8, and wherein the

referencing block is a master information block, and wherein the system information block type

field for the master information block is an "SIB and SB type" information element (Col 3. ll.11-

12 and 20-23).

While Wiberg discloses the method of Claim 8, it does not explicitly teach that the protocol blocks belong to a Radio Resource Control Protocol. However the preceding limitation is known in the art of communications. Numminen discloses at ¶ 45 line 36, that the User Equipment can send protocol blocks via a Radio Resource Channel. Numminen also discloses that this method is to control device specific behavior dues to specific manufacturer data (¶ 5 ll. 5-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art who would want use Applicants' method of accounting for specific manufacturer system information and would want to reduce errors in that system to use the manufacturer specific techniques of Numminen with respect to protocol blocks.

With regard to Claims 13 and 14, Wiberg in view of Numminen discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the protocol blocks belong to a Radio Resource Control (RRC) protocol, wherein the referencing block is a scheduling block (discussed with respect to Claims 8 and 12 above). Creating a scheduling information block that has SIB type SIBS only as the information element of for the system information block type field is well known in the art of communications and is part of the 3GPPP TS 25.331 V3.17.0 (2003-12) document that Applicant references in their specification. When using Wiberg's method for transmitting System Information Blocks, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the field values for those blocks that were known prior to the application herein.

With regard to Claim 45, Wiberg in view of Numminen discloses the method of claim 39, wherein the protocol blocks belong to a Radio Resource Control (RRC) protocol, and wherein the referencing block is a scheduling block (discussed with respect to Claims 8 and 12 above) and wherein the system information block type field for the scheduling information block is an "SIB type SIBS only" information element.

Creating a scheduling information block that has SIB type SIBS only as the information element of for the system information block type field is well known in the art of communications and is part of the 3GPPP TS 25.331 V3.17.0 (2003-12) document that Applicant references in their specification. When using Wiberg's method for transmitting System Information Blocks, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the field values for those blocks that were known prior to the application herein.

6.   Claims 31-35, 39-46, & 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiberg in view of "Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS); Radio Resource Control (RRC) protocol specification (3GPP TS 25.331 version 5.5.0 Release 5) aka TS 25.331V 5.5.0 (2003)" ("TS 25.331")

With regard to Claim 31, while Wiberg teaches the method of Claim 8, it does not explicitly including in the referencing block a code set identifier which identifies a selected one of plural code sets for use in interpreting the system information block type value included in the system information block type field of the system information block referenced by the referencing block. However the preceding limitations are known in the field of communications.

The Wiberg patent references TS 25.331 as of the 1999 version. Furthermore Applicant acknowledges TS 25.331 and its ancestry in Applicant's specification. TS 25.331 at section 10.3.8.21 mentions the subsets of SIB codes that must be filled in. A code set identifier is the same as a code prefix. Code prefixes identify subsets of codes. Using code prefixes in telecommunications is well known. Area codes are a type of code prefix. Even area codes are referenced in TS 25.331 (section 10.3.1.15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to look at the Wiberg references, locate them, and combine them with the Wiberg patent, to solve the problem of how to use multiple codes for the codes that would are needed for system information in the Wiberg patent.

With regard to Claim 32, Wiberg further teaches a first value for the code set identifier requires that the system information block type value be interpreted in accordance with a range of nominal system information block type values for a predetermined protocol (Wiberg teaches that if the SIB value received by a mobile station is unknown, i.e. not within a nominal group of known values, then the mobile station will retrieve system information, Col. 15 ll. 49-51, and storing new system information blocks, Col 16. ll. 27-31), and a second value for the code set identifier requires that the system information block type value be interpreted in accordance with a range of extended system information block type values, the extended system information block type values being outside the range of nominal system information block type values.

TS 25.331 discloses using extended values with information elements (section 10.2.5, where it is stated that the string for "NC" should be extended to 4 bits in later versions). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, who is making a code set, and information

elements to convey system information that will take into account new types of equipment, to design such code sets and information elements with room to expand and 'extend' such as extra bits to account for the group of unknown technology which will continue to grow.

With regard to Claim 33, Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 discloses the method of claim 31, and further discloses including the code set identifier in an extension field of the referencing block. TS 25.331 discloses using extended values with information elements (section 10.2.5, where it is stated that the string for "NC" should be extended to 4 bits in later versions). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, who is making a code set, and information elements to convey system information that will take into account new types of equipment, to design such code sets and information elements with room to expand and 'extend' such as extra bits to account for the group of unknown technology which will continue to grow.

With regard to Claim 34, Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 discloses the method of claim 31, and further discloses, further comprising formatting the system information block and the referencing block in accordance with a predetermined protocol (SIB blocks and Referencing blocks are identified in TS 25.331 as being part of the RRC protocol..

With regard to Claim 35, Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 discloses the method of claim 34, and further discloses wherein the predetermined protocol is a Radio Resource Control (RRC) protocol. TS 25.331 groups these blocks under the protocol heading "10.2.5 Radio Resource Control Messages". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, who would want to make sure the different types of equipment in Wiberg would be operational to use the same type of protocol, such as combining Wiberg with the types of protocols in the technical specification that Wiberg references.

With regard to Claim 39, Wiberg teaches the method of Claim 15 but does not explicitly teach further comprising the steps of: obtaining, from the referencing block, a code set identifier which identifies a selected one of plural code sets; and using the selected one of the plural code sets for interpreting the system information block type value included in the system information block type field of the system information block referenced by the referencing block. However the preceding limitation is known in the art of communications.

TS 25.331 at section 10.3.8.21 mentions the subsets of SIB codes that must be filled in. A code set identifier is the same as a code prefix. Code prefixes identify subsets of codes. Using

code prefixes in telecommunications is well known. Area codes are a type of code prefix. Even area codes are referenced in TS 25.331 (section 10.3.1.15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to look at the Wiberg references, locate them, and combine them with the Wiberg patent, to solve the problem of how to use multiple codes for the codes that would are needed for system information in the Wiberg patent.

Furthermore it is well understood by one of ordinary skill in the art in the area of communications that when a message is encoded with a code set, or a plural of code sets, that those sets can be used to interpret, i.e. decode, the encoded messages.

With regard to Claim 49, Wiberg teaches the method of Claim 48 but does not explicitly teach further comprising: means for obtaining, from the referencing block, a code set identifier which identifies a selected one of plural code sets; and means for using the selected one of the plural code sets for interpreting the system information block type value included in the system information block type field of the system information block referenced by the referencing block. However the preceding limitation is known in the art of communications.

TS 25.331 at section 10.3.8.21 mentions the subsets of SIB codes that must be filled in. A code set identifier is the same as a code prefix. Code prefixes identify subsets of codes. Using code prefixes in telecommunications is well known. Area codes are a type of code prefix. Even area codes are referenced in TS 25.331 (section 10.3.1.15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to look at the Wiberg references, locate them, and combine them with the Wiberg patent, to solve the problem of how to use multiple codes for the codes that would are needed for system information in the Wiberg patent.

Furthermore it is well understood by one of ordinary skill in the art in the area of communications that when a message is encoded with a code set, or a plural of code sets, that those sets can be used to interpret, i.e. decode, the encoded messages.

With regard to Claim 40, Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 teaches the method of Claim 39 but does not explicitly teach, wherein a first value for the code set identifier requires that the system information block type value be interpreted in accordance with a range of nominal system information block type values for a predetermined protocol; and a second value for the code set identifier requires that the system information block type value be interpreted in accordance with a range of extended system information block type values, the extended system information

block type values being outside the range of nominal system information block type values. However the preceding limitation is known in the art of communications.

TS 25.331 at section 10.3.8.21 mentions the subsets of SIB codes that must be filled in. A code set identifier is the same as a code prefix. Code prefixes identify subsets of codes. Using code prefixes in telecommunications is well known. Area codes are a type of code prefix. Even area codes are referenced in TS 25.331 (section 10.3.1.15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to look at the Wiberg references, locate them, and combine them with the Wiberg patent, to solve the problem of how to use multiple codes for the codes that would are needed for system information in the Wiberg patent.

TS 25.331 also discloses using extended values with information elements (section 10.2.5, where it is stated that the string for "NC" should be extended to 4 bits in later versions). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, who is making a code set, and information elements to convey system information that will take into account new types of equipment, to design such code sets and information elements with room to expand and 'extend' such as extra bits to account for the group of unknown technology which will continue to grow.

With regard to Claim 50, Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 teaches the method of Claim 49 wherein a first value for the code set identifier requires that the system information block type value be interpreted in accordance with a range of nominal system information block type values for a predetermined protocol; and a second value for the code set identifier requires that the system information block type value be interpreted in accordance with a range of extended system information block type values, the extended system information block type values being outside the range of nominal system information block type values. However the preceding limitation is known in the art of communications.

TS 25.331 at section 10.3.8.21 mentions the subsets of SIB codes that must be filled in. A code set identifier is the same as a code prefix. Code prefixes identify subsets of codes. Using code prefixes in telecommunications is well known. Area codes are a type of code prefix. Even area codes are referenced in TS 25.331 (section 10.3.1.15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to look at the Wiberg references, locate them, and combine them with the Wiberg patent, to solve the problem of how to use multiple codes for the codes that would are needed for system information in the Wiberg patent.

TS 25.331 also discloses using extended values with information elements (section 10.2.5, where it is stated that the string for "NC" should be extended to 4 bits in later versions). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, who is making a code set, and information elements to convey system information that will take into account new types of equipment, to design such code sets and information elements with room to expand and 'extend' such as extra bits to account for the group of unknown technology which will continue to grow.

With regard to Claim 41, Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 teaches the method of Claim 39 and, obtaining the code set identifier from an extension field of the referencing block. It is inherently understood in the area of telecommunications that when a message is encoded with a code set, or a plural of code sets, that those sets can be used to interpret the encoded messages. Retrieving a code from a field that contains a code is obvious.

With regard to Claim 42, Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 discloses the method of Claim 39 and, deformatting the system information block and the referencing block in accordance with a predetermined protocol. Deformatting a system in accordance with a predetermined protocol is simply <u>decoding</u>. It it is well understood by one of ordinary skill in the art in the area of communications understood in the area of telecommunications that when a message is encoded with a code set, or a plural of code sets, that those sets can be used to interpret the encoded messages. It is well understood by one of ordinary skill in the art in the area of communications that deformatting the system information block and the referencing block in accordance with a predetermined protocol, will occur when there is decoding.

With regard to Claim 43, Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 discloses wherein the predetermined protocol is a Radio Resource Control (RRC) protocol. TS 25.331 groups the system information blocks under the protocol heading "10.2.5 Radio Resource Control Messages". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, who would want to make sure the different types of equipment in Wiberg would be operational to use the same type of protocol, such as combining Wiberg with the types of protocols in the technical specification that Wiberg references.

With regard to Claim 44, Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 discloses wherein the protocol blocks belong to a Radio Resource Control (RRC) protocol, and wherein the referencing block is a master information block, and wherein the system information block type field for the master

information block is an "SIB and SB type" information element (Wiberg Col 3. ll. 21-22,
discloses that the SIB type values are included in master information blocks which contain the
system information blocks 'SIB's' and other referencing information blocks to which the SIB's
refer). TS 25.331 groups the system information blocks under the protocol heading "10.2.5
Radio Resource Control Messages". Under the following section 10.3, TS 25.331 discloses
wherein the system information block type field for the master information block is an "SIB and
SB type" information element (10.3.8.14 specifically). It would have been obvious to one of
ordinary skill in the art, who would want to make sure the different types of equipment in
Wiberg would be operational to use the same type of protocol, such as combining Wiberg with
the types of protocols in the technical specification that Wiberg references.

      With regard to Claim 45, Wiberg teaches the method of Claim 39, but does not
explicitly teach wherein the protocol blocks belong to a Radio Resource
Control (RRC) protocol, and wherein in the system information block the system information
block type field includes a "SIB Type" information element. However, the preceding limitation
is known in the art of communications.

      TS 25.331 discloses wherein the protocol blocks belong to a Radio Resource Control
(RRC) protocol, and wherein the referencing block is a master information block, and wherein
the system information block type field for the master information block is an "SIB and SB type"
information element (Wiberg Col 3. ll. 21-22, discloses that the SIB type values are included in
master information blocks which contain the system information blocks 'SIB's' and other
referencing information blocks to which the SIB's refer). TS 25.331 groups the system
information blocks under the protocol heading "10.2.5 Radio Resource Control Messages".
Under the following section 10.3, TS 25.331 discloses wherein the system information block
type field for the master information block is an "SIB and SB type" information element
(10.3.8.14 specifically). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, who
would want to make sure the different types of equipment in Wiberg would be operational to use
the same type of protocol, such as combining Wiberg with the types of protocols in the technical
specification that Wiberg references.

      With regard to Claim 46, Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 discloses the method of claim
39, and wherein the protocol blocks belong to a Radio Resource Control (RRC) protocol, and

wherein in the system information block the system information block type field includes a "SIB Type" information element. TS 25.331 groups the system information blocks under the protocol heading "10.2.5 Radio Resource Control Messages". Under the following section 10.3, TS 25.331 discloses wherein the system information block type field for the master information block is an "SIB and SB type" information element (10.3.8.14 specifically). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, who would want to make sure the different types of equipment in Wiberg would be operational to use the same type of protocol, such as combining Wiberg with the types of protocols in the technical specification that Wiberg references.

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSHUA SCHWARTZ whose telephone number is (571)270-7494. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Harper can be reached on 571-272-7605. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

     Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joshua Schwartz/   /VINCENT P. HARPER/
 Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617   Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617